

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/805,352	03/22/2004	Jae-Ryong Park	1572.1205	9008
21171 7590 02/22/2007 STAAS & HALSEY LLP			EXAMINER	
SUITE 700	JULI LLI		ALEXANDER, REGINALD	
1201 NEW YO WASHINGTO	RK AVENUE, N.W.		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTO	11, DC 20003		1761	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		02/22/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

_
5
0

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/805,352	PARK ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Reginald L. Alexander	1761			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 D	ecember 2006.				
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)☐ This	∑ This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under be	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims		,			
4) Claim(s) 1,2,5-9,11 and 12 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1, 2, 5-9, 11 and 12 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomposed applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se tion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ojected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applicat ority documents have been receiv u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage			
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	Pate			

Application/Control Number: 10/805,352

Art Unit: 1761

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 7-9, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clark in view of Kim et al.

There is disclosed in Clark an oven having a main body 12, 14, 16, 18, the oven comprising: a rear panel 30 detachably placed inside the main body; side panels 28 detachably connected to opposite sides of the rear panel; an upper heater 42 and a lower heater 52 disposed at an upper panel 34 and a lower panel 36 of the oven, the upper heater providing a downwardly sloped protrusion in the upper panel; and a ceramic material coating 32, 38 on the surface of the oven panels.

Coleman discloses the use of an upper downwardly sloped heater 6 and lower heater 7 arranged within a heating oven.

Kim discloses an upper heater 41 which can be sloped downwardly.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to substitute the heater arrangement taught in Clark with that taught in Kim, in order to enhance the heating ability of the oven.

In regards to the recited use of the device as a bread maker, there is provided no structure in the claims to define the device as such.

Art Unit: 1761

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hedenberg '009 in view of Clark.

There is disclosed in Hedenberg a bread maker, comprising: a main body 2; an oven (see fig. 2) having side walls; a door 10; an upper sloped heater 20 and lower heater 18; a baking tray 25; and baking tray rails 34 connected to a lower portion of the oven side walls.

Clark, as discussed in the rejection above, discloses the use of rear and side oven panels having a ceramic coating, as well as an upper panel (upper bending part) and lower panel (lower bending part) attached to an upper end and lower end of the rear panel.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to provide a ceramic coating on the oven side walls of Hedenberg as taught by Clark, in order to protect the surface of the walls.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to provide the oven of Hedenberg with rear, upper and lower detachable walls in addition to the side walls as taught by Clark, for the purpose of providing a complete enclosed oven chamber having good heat reflecting capabilities. Additionally, the walls of the oven will provide protection from heat for the surrounding elements within the main body of the bread maker.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 21 December 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the prior art fails to disclose an upper heater being sloped downward towards a center of the oven. A view of figure 3 of Hedenberg discloses that the upper heater 20 is sloped downward and a center portion of the sloping heater is directed toward a center of the oven so as to project heat in a direction toward a baking tray.

Page 4

Applicant's argument that there is no motivation to combine Kim with the Clark reference is noted. Applicant states that the objective of Clark would be defeated by the use of an upper downwardly sloped heating element such as that disclosed in Kim. The teaching in Kim is that a heating element which can be placed in various locations would provide an improvement in the control of a heating array within the oven. Thus, even with the desire to heat panels, as taught in Clark, it can be done so with the control provided in Kim.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Application/Control Number: 10/805,352

Art Unit: 1761

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Reginald L. Alexander whose telephone number is 571-

272-1395. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Milton Cano can be reached on 571-272-1398. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Reginald L. Alexander Primary Examiner

Page 5

Art Unit 1761

rla

05 February 2007